

done. There was a practical difficulty. The answers have been printed at the rate of ten questions per list. So, there is a certain amount of incongruity in the direction I have given. I propose that for the succeeding list it will be only ten questions and thereafter every list will contain twelve questions.

Senates of the Mysore and Karnatak Universities—Names of Members announced.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In connection with the election to the Senates of the Mysore and Karnatak Universities, as the number of candidates is equal to the number of seats to be filled in, the following members are declared elected and consequently there will be no elections in this behalf.

Senate of the Mysore University:—

Sriyuths:—

1. S. M. Krishna
2. G. Madegowda
3. C. J. Muckannappa
4. R. Muniswamiah
5. Smt. Nagarathnamma Hiremath
6. T. R. Parameswaraiah

Senate of the Karnatak University:—

Sriyuths:—

1. Smt. Basavarajeswari
2. C. M. Desai
3. R. A. Koppal
4. Siddaiah Veeraiah Kashimath.

2-00 P.M.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the report of the Resources and Economy Committee.

VOTING OF DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS FOR 1956-57 AND 1957-58

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister for Finance is just smiling and hinting that I am saying something in

regard to the procedure *re*: this excess demand. The Hon'ble Members would have seen that the item in the Agenda is voting of excess Demands and the word used is "voting" and that is rightly so for the reason that this is not a normal demand and that it is not a supplementary demand. A supplementary demand is occasioned when before the financial year is out, it is seen that either a new service is to be started or more money is wanted for a scheme. This is not a supplementary demand. This is an excess amount of expenditure as has already been incurred. There are such contingencies. It does not occur for the first time in this House. It occurs all over and in all Legislatures. When expenditure is incurred, there is the audit report and when the audit report is submitted, it is seen that there are a few items of excess expenditure and that certain reconciliations have not been effected and the report has been submitted. That report is dealt with by the Public Accounts Committee and that Committee goes into the matter thoroughly and a report is given. And, the report of the Public Accounts Committee covering the period in question has already been discussed—the report of 1956-57 and 1957-58—and the debate with regard to the matter is absolutely over. But at the time of discussing the Public Accounts Committee's report, there was no voting. But Members have had the fullest opportunity to Debate on it. This is wanted only for the purposes of voting. The procedure that is normally followed is that it will be directly put to vote. There is no scope for debate for the reason that the debate is already over when the report of the Public Accounts Committee was before the House. That is why the wording in the Agenda is—voting of excess demands.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palya).—Sir, it is not a question of debate. But I am surprised to see that inordinate delay has been caused for regularising this expenditure. It relates to the years 1957-58. And now they are coming before the House to get our approval. Why has this

(SRI G. VENKATAI GOWDA)

inordinate delay been caused? Under article 205 of the Constitution, there is a mandate that if Government incurs expenditure over the amounts sanctioned, they have to come before the House for approval.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA (Turuvekere).—Sir the motion is not before the House.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—What came in the way of the Government to come before this House in 1962-63 for approval of that excess expenditure? Is there any special reason which the Government could assign?

†**Sri B. D. JATTI**.—After the Public Accounts Committee report was discussed, there has been no delay on the part of the Government to come to this House and get their approval.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Why should Government have waited for the discussion of this matter? As soon as the year was over, the normal procedure for them was to have come before the House for getting approval for the excess expenditure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble member perhaps did not comprehend me fully because I was not clear enough. These are things which are discovered at the time when the audit is done and the audit report is furnished a year later. After that, it is correctly dealt with by the Public Accounts Committee. The Public Accounts Committee's report is the one that deals exhaustively with this matter. That report has been discussed in the House. That was done, I believe, in November or December.

.....My Secretary tells me that it was done in November.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Replies were given by the Government at that time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Approval of the House could have been taken immediately. But at that time, in November and December, you know how the business was giving on and there was so much of other business not to speak of the elections.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—The money was spent during the year 1957-58.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let us see what the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition has to say.

†**Sri S. SIVAPPA** (Sravana-belagola).—Under rule 171 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Assembly, it is specifically provided that "supplementary, additional, excess and exceptional grants and votes of credit shall be regulated by the same procedure as is applicable in the case of demands for grants....." Sir, the same procedure which has to be adopted for the discussion on demands has to be followed in the case of voting of these excess grants as provided under Rule 171. So, Sir, while placing these excess demands before the House, I request the Chair to allow the same procedure as is allowed for discussion on other demands.

†**ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ** (ಸಿರಾ).—ಅಡಿಟ್ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಅಡಿಟ್ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಕಂಡು ಹಿಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಖರ್ಚಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯವರ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು? ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ಅಭ್ಯಾಸ, ಅವಾಂತರ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಪೋರಾಗಿದೆ, ಎನ್ನು ತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಅದೆ ಕ್ರೋಸ್ಟರ ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ "ಸಂಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮಾರಾಧನೆ, ಗುಂಪಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಗೋವಿಂದ" ಎನ್ನುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಬಡ್ಡಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಈ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ ಹಣ ಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಒಂದ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—This House must be given an opportunity for discussing this item, because it is a demand actually. So this demand cannot be granted unless the procedure is followed. That it has to be discussed has already been pointed out by the Hon'ble Member.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—The matters pertain to the years 1956-57 and 1957-58. It is the practice of this House and also of other Houses that the Public Accounts Committee report should be discussed and after the

discussion and the reply by the Government thereto, these matters are brought before the House for its approval. That is the intention.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—There is nothing in the Constitution to prevent excess expenditure being incurred Sir, as you are a ware.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am very attentive.

†**Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.**—We shall take, for instance, the Budget Estimates for the year 1956-57. Then, only the estimates are given and the revised estimates are shown during the year 1957-58. So the actuals for the year 1956-57 are shown in the year 1957-58. At least the Government could have found out in the year 1958-59 that it has spent more than what was voted by the Assembly for the year 1956-57. When the Government gave the actuals for the year 1956-57 in the year 1958-59 it should have found out this excess and according to the provisions of the Constitution it should have come before the House and got its approval for the excess expenditure. That was not done. I do not understand why the Government should have waited for the Public Accounts Committee to find out this and report to the Assembly that such and such an irregularity has been committed. Only after the Public Accounts Committee made a report on this, the Government has thought it fit to come before the Assembly. The Government should not have waited for such a long period. I submit that there has been an inordinate delay in bringing this matter before the House to get its approval. So, I submit that a debate should take place on this demand.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Will it not amount to a violation of the Constitution? This is a strange thing that has happened in this Legislature.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—May I know to which article the Hon'ble member is referring?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I am not a Sunday lawyer. When my friend Sri Jatti was in Jamkhandi he had no practice. Let him not ask me what article I am

referring to. I am quite aware of my responsibility. I am quite aware under what section of the law or Constitution I have to take shelter when I raise an objection. My friend the Finance Minister who committed a blunder when he was the Chief Minister wants to say something to evade his responsibility.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—The demands refer to the years 1956-57 and 1957-58. Let him correct himself accordingly.

Sri ANGADI CHANNABASAPPA (Hadagali).—Apart from the provisions of rule 172, the discussion and the voting must go together. The Members who have discussed only are entitled to vote the demand.

†**Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR (Belgaum City).**—This is an irregularity relating to the excess expenditure incurred in the years 1956-57 and 1957-58. This was pointed out in the Audit Report. The Audit Report was submitted about three years ago and so there was no necessity for the Government to wait for the Report of the Public Accounts Committee to come before this House for its approval for the excess expenditure. This only shows that there has been an inordinate delay in bringing this matter before the House and seeking its approval. This irregularity should have been brought to the notice of the House much earlier and its approval should have been obtained for the same.

†**Sri S. SIVAPPA.**—The very purpose of making the provision contained in article 205 is that when the Government by oversight spends some money over and above the budgeted amount, it should regularise it by coming to the House with an excess demand for its approval. The Government committed the mistake of spending over and above the amount sanctioned by this House in the years 1956-57 and 1957-58. That is about six years ago and now one fine morning in July 1962 it has brought this demand before the House only for its vote. This is nothing but curtailing the rights of this august House, taking us by surprise and asking us to vote for the amount which was spent irregularly. Article 205 has been inserted in the Constitution to regularise it at an early

(SRI S. SIVAPPA)

date. This irregularity was committed in the year 1956-57. The Government closed its eyes for 6 long years and now it has come before the Assembly to regularise it. This is the gravest error it has committed in this democratic set up. If democracy is to function well this power of Government to spend moneys over and above the sanctioned budget should be curbed. This is one of the gravest errors committed by the Government in this democratic set-up. This is a very serious matter which deserves to be discussed in this House. Government cannot go on spending money according to its whims and fancies. When it spends something more than the budgeted amount, then according to the provisions of the Constitution it should come before the Assembly at the earliest, at least within 6 months after the error was found out. This error was found out by the Public Accounts Committee and that Committee in its report has made a suggestion to the Government that it has done something very wrong and that that should be corrected with the approval of the House. The Public Accounts Committee itself found out this error only after three or four years after it was committed. Then also the Government did not come before the House immediately to rectify the mistake. This shows that the Government has treated this Assembly with scant respect. This is something ridiculous and something shameful for democracy. I want to appeal to you Sir, to control this Government by giving your ruling that there should be a full-dress debate on this demand.

SRI G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—I have got another point. The Government has come before this House which has been constituted after the elections of 1962 for getting its approval for a thing that happened during the years 1956-57 and 1957-58. I am doubtful whether this House is competent to give its approval for the simple reason that the sanction for these demands was given by a House that was constituted after the elections in 1957. It was during that period that the amount

was spent. So the point is whether this House can be asked to give its approval for a thing that happened when this august House was not constituted. This is also a point for consideration.

†SRI K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore City).—Sir, article 204 (3) says that subject to the provision of article 205 and article 206 no money shall be withdrawn from the Consolidated Fund of the State. I would like to know from Government whether any amount now sought to be voted by this House has been withdrawn from the Consolidated Fund of the State in the years 1956-57 or 1957-58 and if any money had been withdrawn, is it not an act against the articles of the Constitution?

SRI B. D. JATTI.—I have already said that this is the convention or procedure followed everywhere. This report was brought to the notice of Government in November and had the Public Accounts Committee report been discussed at that time, we would have brought it to the notice of the House, but as the Assembly was very busy with other work, it was not possible. If there is any delay, it is from the month of November till now. If the Hon'ble Members are interested in discussing all these items, they can start the discussion and I will reply to the debate.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಡ್ಕೇಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು Contingency Fundನಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೇ ಎನಿಸಾ Consolidated Fundನಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಹಾಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿ ದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

MR. SPEAKER.—Everybody has said enough. Because I was myself new to the subject, I wanted to clarify my own ideas and save the time of this House. I find that one Member raised a point which another Member has answered. Somebody said that the amounts had been taken from the Consolidated Fund while another member said that they had been taken from the Contingency Fund. So far as the idea of Excess Demand is concerned, it is something different from the Supplementary Demands. The basic idea of Excess Demand is that it is something which is spent in excess of what is

authorised. The next element is that it is spent during the year but not discovered before the year is out, but discovered much later when the audit report is submitted. The audit goes into great details and if we have regard to the large amounts that are spent and the number of heads and sub-heads on which they are spent, there is no doubt that there is room for bonafide mistake or the auditor may find that there is some error in the reconciliation of accounts. Hon'ble Members know that errors and omissions are accepted. Facts are facts and if the auditor discovers certain mistakes, he does his duty properly by pointing them out. It is always a safeguard for the public and for the voters. Government has to apply its mind and it can say, "We bring it before you for sanction and put it in the shape of a demand for what might be called ratification", because it is post mortem. Therefore, the only way is to ratify the Excess Demand. That is why article 205 of the Constitution is provided for. It has two clauses ; the first clause deals with Supplementary Demand and the second clause with Excess Demand. The two are not put in the same category and the basic distinction is this, *viz.*, that Supplementary Demand is put forward before the House before the financial year has run out whereas an Excess Demand comes up later on.

Now, the length of the period by which it comes later is dependent upon many circumstances. The question has been discussed as to whether an Excess Demand should not come before the House and whether it should be left to the P.A.C. to be dealt with. This matter has not come up here for the first time. In fact, I found from the reports of the proceedings of this House itself that a demand was put and objection was raised "How can you deal with it until a body constituted for the purpose of scrutinising it, *viz.*, The Public Accounts Committee has dealt with it" and the ruling has been given by the Speaker that though it has not been dealt with by the P.A.C. the House is not precluded from considering it. The

appropriate procedure is that the P.A.C. deals with this matter and makes a report. What the P.A.C. does is that it goes into the matter and makes its recommendations which are embodied in a report. That report comes before the House and the House has to see whether the recommendations made by that committee are wrong or should be accepted or should not be accepted or whether criticism should be levelled against it or what is the fallacy in the reasoning of the Public Accounts Committee—all this forms the subject matter of the debate by the House. As I said, in the House of Commons the P.A.C. or whatever be the appropriate committee, deals with this matter and after it has applied its mind, it comes to the House of Commons. Here also, it has come up in the same manner. So far as the discussion on the P.A.C. Report is concerned, it is over and therefore the matter ends there.

Then it was said that there had been delay. A certain amount of delay is inevitable. There are so many mistakes which go undiscovered and which do not come to light at all, but some mistakes are discovered and the stage at which they are discovered is necessary when the audit is done. The audit takes place after the financial year is over having regard to the vouchers, details of sanction, etc., and the Accountant General points out irregularities. If the Hon'ble Members will now refer to the demands, what is it that has happened? There are three items in respect of which excess expenditure has been incurred. They are Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax in respect of which the excess expenditure is Rs. 541. An error does take place in totalling up amounts running to several crores or lakhs. The next item is I.N.E. and D. Works (Commercial)—Working Expenses in respect of which the excess expenditure is Rs. 4 lakhs and odd. The next item is Payments of Commuted Value of Pensions in respect of which the excess expenditure is Rs. 655. This amount has to be paid and has been paid. If it has been paid, what is it

(MR. SPEAKER)

that the debate is going to achieve? Therefore, the procedure that has been followed in all other Legislatures or in many legislatures including the House of Commons and the Lok Sabha is that, so far as this matter is concerned, little or no debate takes place. It will be seen that Excess Demands can be voted upon and the only thing that has to be debated is the time lag. Hon'ble Members also must remember that all these items relate to the year 1956-57 i.e. the period of transition when the reorganisation took place and the new Mysore State was formed.

2-30 P.M.

If you refer to that, you will see that there also amounts are not at all so large and so many. In fact the delay is one which might be a ground for certain amount of criticism; criticism against whom? criticism against the present Government or the Government 1956-57? All that you have been saying is noted and it is for future guidance and the criticism that has been made is also for future guidance. Should the budget debate for 1962-63 be held up for fourteen days? One point was raised with regard to vote. The House deliberated; Members have participated in the discussion in 1956-57 or 1958-59. One little error; the House is the same; the Legislature is the same; Members may change; some may change and more new faces may come; but the legislature is the same. If the Legislature has transacted business regarding a particular point, that new entrants have come in, is not a point on which fresh discussion should be allowed.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The unusual coincidence is that the Chief Minister in 1956-57 and at the present time is the same Chief Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is that coincidence going to contribute anything merits of the case? Absolutely not. I have told you all that I wanted to. I have not even referred to the texts of the various books. But I may tell you that it will not at all be necessary or wise or even proper to spend time on a debate of this type. You may ask for any little clarification.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ನಮಿತಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಬರುವವರೆಗೆ ಕಾಯಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹಿಂದಿನ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಇದೆ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಯಾವ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಸರಿ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That ruling also stands; this ruling also stands. Two ways are open. Neither of them is illegal

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—While asking for clarification, I want to ask the Government why such a long delay was caused in bringing forth this excess demand to this House? When this was pointed out by the Public Accounts Committee,—I think there is Accounts Department in the Government also,—what were they doing for all these seven years? What is the explanation that the Government will give for such a long delay as seven years?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—The Public Accounts Committee Report was presented to the Government on the 28th September 1960 and that report was discussed in the month of November 1961 and so the delay is only five or six months and not more than that.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Is it understood that the Government was busy with electioneering work rather than the finances? When it was brought to the notice of the Government why did they not bring it before the House immediately? My inference is that they were busy with electioneering rather than the finances of the State.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before we proceed further, I would suggest to the Hon'ble Minister to move the Demands.

Demand No. 1.—Taxes on income other than Corporation Tax.

4. TAXES ON INCOME OTHER THAN CORPORATION TAX.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—Sir, on the recommendation of the Governor of Mysore, I beg to move:

“That a sum of Rs. 541 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure

incurred over the voted grants for the year 1956-57 (1st November 1956 to 31st March 1957), in respect of "Taxes on income other than Corporation Tax".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 541 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year 1956-57 (1st November 1956 to 31st March 1957), in respect of 'Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax'."

Now that demand No. 1 has been moved, the rest of the demands, *viz.*, Demands Nos. 42 and 55 for the year 1956-57 and Demands Nos. 1, 10, 22, 33 34, 35 and 42 for the year 1957-58, will be treated as having been moved.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—I wanted to ask when for the first time this Government noticed that they had spent in excess of what was allotted by this House?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—When the audit report was submitted to the Government, this was noticed.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Is it in the year 1960 or even earlier?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—It was in August 1959.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—When it was found out in August 1959 that this amount had been spent in excess of what had been sanctioned by this House, from 1959 to 1962 what prevented the Government from getting the ratification of this House for that excess amount?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—We were awaiting the Public Accounts Committee Report and also discussion thereon in this House. After we discussed the Report and replies were given, now it is time for placing it before the House.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—What prevented the Government from placing these Demands earlier?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The audit report has to be scrutinised and gone into by the Public Accounts Committee which deals with all the Excess Demands.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Is it necessary to wait for the discussion of the Public Accounts Committee Report?

Under article 205 of the Constitution, the only course for the Government is to come before the House and get it ratified. May I know the specific reason for the Government to wait for the deliberations of the Public Accounts Committee?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—It is a convention established everywhere to wait for the Public Accounts Committee Report and also for discussion thereon in the Hon'ble House.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—When there is a specific provision in the Constitution, can a convention which is not known at least so far as I am concerned, come in the way?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now with a view to clarify the procedure, I mentioned and perhaps the Hon'ble Member did not catch my point. These are the proceedings which I am reading. It is September 1956 to October 1956, Page 2116, column 2,

"**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The Procedure to be adopted in connection with Excess Grants is also the same that was adopted in regard to Grants. Therefore, discussion has to close today at the appointed time. With the consent of the House, I want to fix the time limit for each speaker.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T.-Narasipur).—May I make a submission, Sir? When once Demands for Excess Grants are placed before the House, the discussion on the Public Accounts Committee's Report would be really unnecessary. The Demands for Excess Grants are based on the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. Therefore the Public Accounts Committee Report should first be taken into consideration. Then only we can vote Excess Grants as pointed out by the Public Accounts Committee."

That is the procedure. Then when objection was taken, it was voted upon there. I am only saying that both ways are open. It could have been brought and if it was not brought, there is nothing wrong.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—A distinction has to be made in this case as to why that Member Sri S. Srinivasa lyengar insisted on finding out whether the excess expenditure is genuine or not, and that they have authorised the PAC. But when the amount is spent, is it not the duty of the Government to rectify the defect?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is why it is not before this House.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—For the information of the Hon'ble members I shall read rule 250(4):

"If any money has been spent on any service during a financial year in excess of the amount granted by the Assembly for that purpose, the Committee shall examine with reference to the facts of each case the circumstances leading to such an excess and make such recommendation as it may deem fit."

So, when we have the recommendations of the Committee, we have come before this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Otherwise it will be a violation of the rule.

There is no conflict between the provision in the Constitution and the convention or the procedure, that is followed here. A little fallacy in the mind of the Hon'ble Member is the time lag in bringing this demand before the House. There is no period fixed within which it should be brought.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರೇ, ಎಕ್ಸೆಸ್ ಡಿಮಾಂಡ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದಹಾಗೆ ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಇಕ್ಕಟ್ಟಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಎಕ್ಸೆಸ್ ಡಿಮಾಂಡ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತರುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪಹೇಳನ ಮಾಡುವಂತಹುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು 1958ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಆಗಲೇ ಸರಿಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡದೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷ ಹೀಗೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿದ್ದು ವಿಷಾದಕರವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ನಮ್ಮ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಅಲಕ್ಷ್ಯ ಮನೋಭಾವವನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಕೌಂಟಿಂಗ್ ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಮೇಲಿಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ನಿಜವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಂಗತಿ ದೃಢಪಡಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೇಲಿಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಂದನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನೀವು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಆದರೂ ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಯಿದೆ

ಮಾಯವಾಗಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಾಯಿದೆಗೆ ಇದು ಮದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಯಿತೋ ಆಗ ಎಲ್ಲೆಯವರೆಗೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಾಯಿದೆ ವಾಸಿ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಅಲ್ಲೆಯವರೆಗೂ ಅದೇ ಮದ್ದು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನೋಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಹೀಗಾದರೂ ಕೊನೆಗೂ ಕಾಯಿದೆ ವಾಸಿಯಾಗದೆ ಹೋದರೆ, ಅಂಥ ಶರೀರಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತೇಇದೆ; ಅದನ್ನು ಸುಟ್ಟುಹಾಕುವುದೊಂದೇ ಶಾಸ್ತಿ. ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅಲಕ್ಷ್ಯದಿಂದ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆಯೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದೊಂದು ಪ್ರತ್ಯಕ್ಷ ನಿದರ್ಶನವಾಗಿದೆ. ನಾನು ಮೊನ್ನೆ ತಾನೆ ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ನಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿರುವುದು 106 ಇವೆ. ಇದೂ ಒಂದು ಹಾಗೆಯೇ. ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಡಿಮಾಂಡ್ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. 1956-57, ಮತ್ತು 1957-58ರಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಿಜಲಿಂಗ ಪ್ಪನವರು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದವರು ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಎಂದಾಗ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಈಗತಾನೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಆಯಿತು; ಗಡಿಬಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈಗಲೂ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಎನ್ನೋ ಎನ್ನುವುದು. ಆದರೂ ಇದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಧೈರ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ; ತಾವು ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ತಪ್ಪನ್ನೇ ಸಾಧನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನೀವು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇ ಸರಿಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಹಲ ಮಾರ್ತನವನ್ನು ಬಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹೀಗೆ accounting procedureನ್ನು ಪ್ರೈವೇಟಿಯಾಗಿ ದಾಖಲೆ ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವ ಸಾಮರಾಜ್ಯ ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳಿವೆ. ನಾನು ಉತ್ತರಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಡಿಕ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದನ್ನು ನೋಟಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದೇನಿದ್ದರೂ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ತಾತ್ಕಾರಿಕ ಮನೋಭಾವವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷ್ಯಭೂತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಾದರೂ ಈ ರೀತಿ ತಪ್ಪು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆಯಿಡಬೇಡಿ. ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. 1957-58ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅದೇ ತಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಆಗಲೇ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತಲ್ಲವೇ? ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ ಪ್ರಕಾರವೂ ತಮ್ಮದು ತಪ್ಪೋ ನೆಪೋ ಏನಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಆಗಲೇ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತರಬಹುದೆಂದು ನೋಚಿತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆಗಿದ್ದ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡುವ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಈಗ ನಾವು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಬಂದವರು, ಏನೇನು ಅಪರಾಧ ನಡೆದಿದೆಯೋ ಯಾರು ಬಲ್ಲರು? ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಈ ತಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಯಾರು ಕಾರಣವೋ ಅವರನ್ನು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಮಾಡುವ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಇದು ಸರಿ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿ, ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಇಂಥ ಅಪರಾಧವನ್ನು—ಕ್ರಮಾಪಣೆಗೆ ಮೀರಿ ಅಪರಾಧವನ್ನು—ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ನೂಕನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನೀವು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯೇ ತಪ್ಪೇ ಎಂದು ನಾಯಾಂಗ ಇರಾಖೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದರೇ? ಹೇಗೆ ಈ ತಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಏನಾದರೂ ಕೇಳಿದರೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಾವೀಗ

ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಕೊಡಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಾನೀಗ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. Any body can sue the Government ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. Whether this Government should be sued or that Government must be sued, I want to know. ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಸಣ್ಣ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯವರು ಹೀಗೆ ಅಚಾತುರ್ಯ ನಡೆಸಿ unauthorised expenditure ನಡೆಸಿ ಜನರಲ್ ಬಾಡಿ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದರೆ, ಅವರನ್ನು Surcharge ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು? ಅವರು resign ಮಾಡಬೇಕೇ, ಬೇಡವೇ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—The Hon'ble Finance Minister quoted rule 250 (4). That is about the procedure which is in no way connected with the provision of Art. 205 (b) of the Constitution. The provision of the Constitution lays down a stipulation that whenever expenditure is incurred in excess, a statement should be laid in the House. So, there is no conflict between the rule and the provision of the Constitution. The rule says that the Committee is asked to find out the circumstances leading to the excess expenditure but the Constitution says that whenever excess expenditure is incurred it should come before the House and the approval of the House should be obtained. I cannot understand why the Government should have waited without coming to this House for obtaining sanction. Supposing the Committee had said that the expenditure incurred was illegal.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the use of the report if all these irregularities are not pointed out? Why should the report be given at all?

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Whether the expenditure is proper or not, if amounts had been spent illegally, would the loss be made good? Sir, the Hon'ble Speaker has given an interpretation. It may be that some people may accept it. But it could also be interpreted in this way. The Government could not have waited for the report of the Public Accounts Committee to come before this House. Suppose the Public Accounts Committee said that it was bad expenditure. Will the Government make good the

expenditure? I say, Sir, that there has been inordinate delay, an inexcusable delay.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಕಾನ್ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ನಿನ 205ನೆಯ ಅನುಚ್ಛೇದದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಯಾವುದೇ ಆಗಲೇ ಆ ವರ್ಷವೇ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಸರಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ I am sorry. ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಹಿಂದೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈಗ ಈ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಆಡಿಟ್ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯ. ಖಜಾನದನಂತರವೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಆಡಿಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ತಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿದು ತೋರಿಸುವುದು ಆಡಿಟರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆಡಿಟ್ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಅಕೌಂಟೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಅವರ ವೆಕ್ಸ್ ಪೇಪರ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹಕ್ಕು ಇದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ತಪ್ಪು ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕಲ್ಲ. ಆಡಿಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಯಾರು ಏನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಅದೇ ಪ್ರಧಾನವಾದುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾನ್ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕು. ಆರು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಲೆಕ್ಕವನ್ನು ಈಗ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಅಬಜೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಬರುತ್ತವೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ಕ್ಲಿಯರ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಆಡಿಟ್ ಇರಾಪೆ ಇರುವಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಆ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

“The Committee while taking note of the action taken following up the progress as suggested by the Accountant General. feel that it is necessary for the Finance Department to send in respect of each department a quarterly statement indicating the *pros* and *cons* and objections clearly”. ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ಮೂರು ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೊಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕು. ಮತ್ತೆ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಅಷ್ಟು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡದೇ ಇದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಈ ರೀತಿ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೇನು ಕಾರಣ? ಇಂಥಾದ್ದು ನೋರಾಯ ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಲೇನಿಯನ್ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಏನೂ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. “The Committee remarks that the first statement should be sent to them by the end of December 1961.”

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅವಸರದಿಂದ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಬರ್ಚು ಆಗುವುದು ವರ್ಷದ ಆಮ್ಚರಿ ನೋಳಿಗೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಬರ್ಚಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪುಗಳು ಕಂಡು ಬಂದರೆ ಅವನ್ನು ನೋಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಆಡಿಟರ ಕಲಸ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಮಯ ಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯ

(ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು)

ರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಕಳೆದ ಸಾಲಿನ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅದು ಎಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಕೆಲಸವೆಂಬುದು ಅದರಿಂದಲೇ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ವರದಿ ಬಂದ ನಂತರ ಮೊದಲು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದರ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಮಾದಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ತಾವು ನೋಡಬೇಕು, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಕೂಡಲೇ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡರೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಆಸ್ಪದಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂಥಾದ್ದು ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಾಗ ಇದು ಬದ್ಧ ಹೋದರೆ ಅಗ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಕೆಲಸವೂ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ; ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಅದು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದರೂ ಫಲವಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಟ್ಟಾಗಿ ಬದ್ಧ ಹೋದುದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಏನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡ.—ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ವರದಿ ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ...

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಅಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕು. ಇದರ ಅನುಭವ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಇರುವ ಕಾರಣ ಆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮುಗಿದನಂತರ ಅದನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದು ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. 1956-57ನೆಯ ಸಾಲಿನ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು 28-9-1960ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಈಗ ತಪ್ಪು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಿಸೋರ್ಚ್ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದಲ್ಲ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಿಲ್ಲ! ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದುದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡಬೇಕು. ಇದನ್ನು stage by stage ಇಡುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದು, ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರವೇ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡಬೇಕು. ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ರೂಲ್‌ಗೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಗೂ ಒಂದೆ ಕೊಂಡು ವಿರೋಧವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನೂ ಆಸ್ಪದವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಕೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿ ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ಒಳಗೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಆರ್. ಕೇಶವಮೂರ್ತಿ.—ಹಿಂದಿನ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯವರು ಇಂಥಾ ಡಿಮಾಂಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಡಿಮಾಂಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು, ಆದರೆ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಬರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅಡಿಟ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ತಪ್ಪು ಕಂಡುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸದೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಬಿಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೇ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri ANGADI CHANNABASAPPA.—With regard to this Demand for 56-57 and 57-58, are they all final? Or, are there going to be any more demands?

Mr. SPEAKER.—At present, they are absolutely final and not even conditional.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—I want to know whether a recommendation of the Governor has been obtained.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Yes, Sir. Before these items are put to vote, I wish to bring to the notice of the Hon'ble House one point. For the year 1956-57, the total amount voted by this House was Rs. 50.95 crores, and the excess is very negligible. It works out to less than one per cent. For the year 1957-58, the amount voted by this House was Rs. 109.66 crores. The excess works out to .5 per cent.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—May I know when the recommendation was given by the Governor?

Sri S. SHIVAPPA.—Sir, the Hon'ble Finance Minister did not give replies to queries raised by Hon'ble Members on this side of the House. He is trying to side-track the main issue by giving figures contained in the Budget estimates. Those figures are known to us. We know how many crores are spent each year. But the relevant point is this:—this was brought to the notice of the Government in the year 1959, according to his own statement, and as noticed by the Chair also. Such an inordinate delay has been caused by Government. What is the explanation that the Finance Minister will give to this House for that?

3-00 P.M.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—From now onwards we will avoid all possible delays. That is all that I can say.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—I want to know whether the Governor's recommendation has been received, and if so, when?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I may inform the House that this will not come up before the House unless I am satisfied that the recommendation of the Governor has been received for the same and it is on the file of the Legislature Secretariat. It was received on the 8th November 1961.

Sri H. R. KESHAVAMURTHY (Gandasi).—I want to know whether

this House is competent to ignore such a mistake.

Mr. SPEAKER.—With all seriousness the Member has raised something which has no merit.

The question is :

“That the respective sums shown in the 1st of demands for grants circulated to Members to cover expenditure incurred in excess of voted grants for the year 1956-57 (1st November 1956 to 31st March 1957) be granted to the Government in respect of demands Nos. 1, 42 and 55.”

The motion was adopted.

[As directed by the Speaker the motions for Demands for Grants to cover expenditure incurred in excess of voted grants for the year 1956-57 (1-11-1956 to 31-3-1957) which were adopted by the House, are reproduced below:]

DEMAND No. 1.—TAXES ON INCOME
OTHER THAN CORPORATION TAX.

4. *Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax.*

“That a sum of Rs. 541 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year 1956-57 (1st November 1956 to 31st March 1957), in respect of ‘Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax’.”

DEMAND No. 42.—WORKING EXPENSES
—I.N.E. AND D. WORKS (COMMERCIAL.)
XVII—I.N.E. and D. Works (Commercial)—Working Expenses.

“That a sum of Rs. 4,06,105 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year 1956-57 (1st November 1956 to 31st March 1957), in respect of ‘XVII—I.N.E. & D. Works (Commercial)—Working Expenses’.”

DEMAND No. 55—COMMUTED VALUE
OF PENSIONS.

83. *Payments of Commuted Value of Pensions.*

“That a sum of Rs. 655 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year 1956-57 (1st November 1956 to 31st March 1957), in respect of ‘Payment of Commuted Value of Pensions’.”

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair].

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet half an hour later.

The House adjourned for recess at Five Minutes past Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty-Five Minutes past Three of the Clock.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the other demands to vote. The question is:

“That the respective sums shown in the list of demands for grants circulated to members to cover expenditure incurred in excess of voted grants for the year 1957-58 be granted to the Government in respect of demands Nos. 1, 10, 22, 33, 34, 35 and 42.”

The motion was adopted.

[As directed by the Speaker the motions for Demands for Grants to cover expenditure incurred in excess of voted grants for the year 1957-58 which were adopted by the House, are reproduced below:]

DEMAND No. 1.—TAXES ON INCOME
OTHER THAN CORPORATION TAX.

4. *Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax.*

“That a sum of Rs. 11,672 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year ended 31st day of March 1958, in respect of ‘Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax’.”

DEMAND No. 10.—IRRIGATION.

18. *Other Revenue Expenditure financed from Ordinary Revenue.*

“That a sum of Rs. 5,62,438 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year ended 31st day of March 1958, in respect of ‘Other Revenue expenditure financed from Ordinary Revenues’.”

DEMAND No. 22.—PUBLIC HEALTH

39. *Public Health*

“That a sum of Rs. 16,42,106 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year ended 31st day of March 1958, in respect of ‘Public Health’.”

DEMAND No. 33.—TERRITORIAL AND POLITICAL PENSIONS.

54-A—*Territorial and Political Pensions.*

“That a sum of Rs. 1,91,692 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year ended 31st day of March 1958, in respect of ‘Territorial and Political Pensions’.”

DEMAND No. 34.—PRIVY PURSES AND ALLOWANCES OF INDIAN RULERS.

54-B—*Privy Purses and Allowances of Indian Rulers.*

“That a sum of Rs. 1,301 be granted to the Government to cover excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year ended 31st day of March 1958, in respect of ‘Privy Purses and Allowances of Indian Rulers’.”

DEMAND No. 35.—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS.

55. *Superannuation Allowances and Pensions.*

“That a sum of Rs. 8,60,888 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year ended 31st day of March 1958, in respect of ‘Superannuation Allowances and Pensions’.”

DEMAND No. 42.—WORKING EXPENSES —I.N.E. and D. WORKS (COMMERCIAL.)

XVII—I. N. E. and D. Works (Commercial)—*Working Expenses.*

“That a sum of Rs. 16,01,181 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants for the year ended 31st day of March 1958, in respect of ‘I.N.E. & D. Works (Commercial) — Working Expenses’.”

VOTING OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 1962-63.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Law).—On the recommendation of the Governor of Mysore, I move :

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 95,14,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year for the period ending 31st March 1963 in respect of Administration of Justice.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 95,14,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year for the period ending 31st March 1963 in respect of Administration of Justice.”

D e m a n d s Nos. 12 and 13 are also before the House and